FILED
MAY 3 1974
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

No. 73-1482

In the
# Supreme Court of the United States
October Term, 1973

EVO R. MANZARDO, et al.,
*Petitioners,*

*vs.*

THE PULLMAN COMPANY, et al.,
*Respondents.*

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit

## BRIEF OF RESPONDENT, THE PULLMAN COMPANY

Hamilton Smith
James E. Betke
Attorneys for Respondent,
The Pullman Company

Of Counsel
McDermott, Will & Emery
111 West Monroe Street
Chicago, Illinois 60603

The Scheffer Press, Inc.—(312) 263-6850

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1973

---

## *No. 73-1482*

---

EVO R. MANZARDO, et al.,

*Petitioners,*

*vs.*

THE PULLMAN COMPANY, et al.,

*Respondents.*

---

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit

---

# BRIEF OF RESPONDENT, THE PULLMAN COMPANY

---

The complaint named Pullman a defendant in Counts I and III, but not in Count II. The Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the dismissal of Counts I and III essentially on the ground that they had been abandoned by the plaintiffs. The petition for certiorari does not challenge the decision of the Court of Appeals in that respect, but challenges only the decision of the Court of Appeals with respect to the unfair representation count, Count II.

If this Court grants the petition for certiorari, we
mit that it should limit the granting of the petitio
those issues raised by the petition.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON SMITH
JAMES E. BETKE
*Attorneys for Respond*
*The Pullman Compa*

Of Counsel

McDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY
111 West Monroe Street
Chicago, Illinois 60603